

REMARKS

Claims **1-39** are pending in the application.

Claims **1-39** have been rejected.

Claims **8, 23** and **32** have been cancelled.

Claims **1-3, 5, 9-10, 17-18, 20, 24-27, 29** and **33-37** have been amended.

Claim **40** has been added.

Examiner Interview

Appreciation is expressed for the telephonic interview conducted on November 2, 2009, between Examiner Yigdall and Sam Campbell, Applicants' attorney. During the interview, the Marik, Akgul, and Fritz references were discussed with reference to independent claims 1, 10, 25, and 34. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments presented herein are in harmony with the discussions had in the interview. Applicants further respectfully submit that the rejections presented in the Office Action are overcome thereby.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marik, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,718 (Marik), in view of Akgul et al., U.S. Publication Application No. 2003/0074650 (Akgul), and in view of Fritz et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,296,187 (Fritz). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1, 10, 25, and 34, to recite the limitations that are not taught or fairly suggested by Marik in view of Akgul and Fritz. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite:

- causing a debugger agent to select a debugger program, wherein
 - the debugger agent is executed on a test server,
 - the debugger program is one of a plurality of debugger programs,
 - the debugger agent is configured to select the debugger program from the plurality of debugger programs,
 - each of the plurality of debugger programs is one of a plurality of platform-specific debugger programs,
 - each of the plurality of platform-specific debugger programs is compatible with at least one of a plurality of computing environments,
 - the debugger program is suitable for at least one device under test of a plurality of devices under test, by virtue of the debugger program being a platform-specific debugger program compatible with a computing environment of the at least one device under test,
 - and
- the at least one device under test is configured to execute a program under test;
- causing the debugger agent to download the debugger program from the test server to the at least one device under test;
- configuring the debugger program to operate in a debugging mode, wherein
 - the debugging mode is one of
 - an automatic debugging mode, and
 - a manual debugging mode;
- sending a plurality of test commands, wherein
 - the test commands are sent from the test server to the at least one device under test, and
 - the test commands are sent according to a test script; and
- activating the debugger program when a watched event occurs during execution of the program under test, wherein
 - in response to the activating the debugger program, the debugger program
 - is configured to
 - automatically execute at least one debugging command, if the debugger program is configured to operate in the automatic debugging mode,
 - and
 - allow the at least one device under test to be controlled via the debugger agent, if the debugger program is configured to operate in the manual debugging mode, and
 - the at least one debugging command is configured to cause information regarding the execution of the program under test to be recorded.

See Claim 1 (as amended). Support for the amendments added to the independent claims can be found, for example, at least at paragraphs 11, 12, 27, 31, 33, and 35-39 of the originally-filed Application.

Applicants have reviewed the cited sections of Marik, Akgul, and Fritz and can find no teaching or fair suggestion of, for example, “each of the plurality of debugger programs is one of a plurality of platform-specific debugger programs, each of the plurality of platform-specific debugger programs is compatible with at least one of a plurality of computing environments, the debugger program is suitable for at least one device under test of a plurality of devices under test, by virtue of the debugger program being a platform-specific debugger program compatible with a computing environment of the at least one device under test.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 25, and 34, and all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell, III /

Samuel G. Campbell, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
Telephone: (512) 439-5084
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099